

Docket No.: SVL920030143US1  
Application No. 10/815,430  
Amendment After Final dated February 15, 2008  
Response to Final Office Action mailed on December 26, 2007

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

In view of the following discussion, the Applicants submit that none of the claims now pending in the application are anticipated under the provisions of 35 USC § 102 (e). Thus, the Applicants believe that all of these claims are now in allowable form.

If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues resulting in adverse action in any of the claims now pending in the application, Applicants request that the Examiner telephone Ms. Janet M. Skafar, Esq. at telephone number (650) 988-0655 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

**Status of Claims**

Claims 1-13 and 40-41 are pending in this application. Claims 14-39 and 42-45 have been canceled.

**The Cancellation of Claims 14-39 and 42-45**

In this amendment, Applicants have canceled claims 14-39 and 42-45 from further consideration in this application. Applicants are not conceding that the subject matter encompassed by claims 14-39 and 42-45 is not patentable. Claims 14-39 and 42-45 were canceled in this Amendment solely to facilitate expeditious prosecution of the remaining claims. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue additional claims, including the subject matter encompassed by claims 14-39 and 42-45, as presented prior to this Amendment in one or more continuing applications.

Docket No.: SVL920030143US1  
Application No. 10/815,430  
Amendment After Final dated February 15, 2008  
Response to Final Office Action mailed on December 26, 2007

Abstract

Because the non-method claims are canceled, Applicants are submitting a new Abstract which changes: "a method, apparatus and article of manufacture display information" to "a method displays information".

The Rejection of Claims 1-13 and 40-41 Under 35 USC § 102 (e)

Claims 1-13 and 40-41 are rejected under 35 USC § 102 (e) as being anticipated by the Graham patent (U.S. Patent No. 7,228,492). Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection.

Applicants respectfully maintain that the Graham patent does not teach each and every recitation of Claim 1. Claim 1 has the recitations of: presenting a first subset of information in a scrollable area, the first subset of information comprising, at least in part, a second subset of information, the second subset of information being designated as a materialization entity; and in response to the first subset of information in the scrollable area being scrolled and at least a portion of the materialization entity being scrolled out of the scrollable area, displaying the materialization entity, at least in part, in a materialization area.

The rejection asserts that the concept indicators 506 of Fig. 5 of the Graham patent are the materialization entities of the claimed invention. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

In the claimed invention, the materialization entity is a subset of information. Unlike the claimed invention, a concept indicator 506 is not a subset of information, but is only a button. The concept indicators 506 of Fig. 5 of the Graham patent are buttons, and those buttons are not part of a first subset of information in the

Docket No.: SVL920030143US1

Application No. 10/815,430

Amendment After Final dated February 15, 2008

Response to Final Office Action mailed on December 26, 2007

scrollable area. The Graham patent further describes the concept indicator in col. 9, lines 4-10, as follows:

FIG. 7C illustrates browser 701 which the user has selected an individual concept, "wearable" as being of interest. The user selects a concept indicator 706a corresponding to the concept "wearable" from among the selectable concept of interest indicators 706. Annotation contour 712 depicts the relative occurrence of the selected concept, "wearable" within the document.

Thus, unlike the materialization entity of the claimed invention, the concept indicator is a button, which is not part of the document, and which is used to select an annotation contour.

In addition, in Fig. 5 of the Graham patent, the text of element 530b is highlighted in a body of information. The Graham patent does not teach how that text became highlighted. Was the text of element 530b highlighted in response to a user clicking on element 506?

Even assuming that the highlighted text of element 530b of the Graham patent is designated as a concept indicator 506 and that the concept indicator is a materialization entity, the Graham patent does not teach the recitation of: in response to the first subset of information in the scrollable area being scrolled and at least a portion of the materialization entity being scrolled out of the scrollable area, displaying the materialization entity, at least in part, in a materialization area.

The materialization entity of the claimed invention is displayed **in response to the first subset of information in the scrollable area being scrolled and at least a portion of the materialization entity being scrolled out of the scrollable area.**

The Graham patent does not teach what happens afterwards in response to the highlighted text, for example the text of element 530b, being scrolled out of view. In Fig. 5, the Graham patent teaches that the concept indicator is an item in a displayed series of items, and that the concept indicator is displayed even if the highlighted text corresponding to the concept indicator is visible in the scrollable area. The Graham patent fails to teach that: in response to the first subset of information in the scrollable area being scrolled and at least a portion of the materialization entity being scrolled out of the scrollable area, displaying the materialization entity, at least in part, in a materialization area.

In addition, the thumbnail display of the Graham patent is also different from claimed invention. The thumbnail of the Graham patent is not displayed in response to the highlighted text in the scrollable area being scrolled out of the scrollable area.

Thus, the Graham patent fails to teach the materialization entity of the claimed invention. In addition, the Graham patent fails to teach what happens in response to at least a portion of the text of element 530b being scrolled out of the scrollable area. Therefore the Graham patent does not teach the recitation of: in response to the first subset of information in the scrollable area being scrolled and at least a portion of the materialization entity being scrolled out of the scrollable area, displaying the materialization entity, at least in part, in a materialization area.

For the foregoing reasons, Claim 1 is not anticipated by the Graham patent. Claims 2-13 and 40-41 depend directly or indirectly from Claim 1, and are not anticipated by the Graham patent for the same reasons as Claim 1.

Docket No.: SVL920030143US1  
Application No. 10/815,430  
Amendment After Final dated February 15, 2008  
Response to Final Office Action mailed on December 26, 2007

Claim 6

Claim 6 has additional recitations not taught by the Graham patent. Claim 6 recites: in response to the at least a portion of the materialization entity being scrolled out of the scrollable area, displaying the materialization area.

The rejection asserts that Fig. 5 of the Graham patent teaches the recitation of Claim 6. Applicants respectfully disagree.

The Graham patent has no teaching of what causes the materialization area to be displayed. The Graham patent fails to teach that **in response to** the at least a portion of the materialization entity being scrolled out of the scrollable area, displaying the **materialization area**.

For the foregoing additional reasons, Applicants respectfully maintain that Claim 6 is not anticipated by the Graham patent.

Claim 8

Claim 8 has additional distinguishing recitations not taught by the Graham patent. Claim 8 has the recitations of: in response to the materialization entity being scrolled back into the scrollable area, deleting the materialization area containing the materialization entity.

The rejection asserts that Fig. 6a, Fig. 6b, and col. 6, lines 53-59 teach the recitation of Claim 8. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Figs. 6a and 6b are flowcharts which teach when a visual indication of locations of concepts of interest, such as a contour graph, is displayed. Col. 6, lines 53-59

Docket No.: SVL920030143US1

Application No. 10/815,430

Amendment After Final dated February 15, 2008

Response to Final Office Action mailed on December 26, 2007

teach a sensitivity control that permits the user to select the degree of sensitivity to apply in identifying potential locations of relevant discussion.

Unlike the claimed invention, the Graham patent fails to teach what happens after highlighted text is scrolled back into the scrollable area. The Graham patent does not teach that a concept indicator is deleted from the series of concept indicators in response to the corresponding highlighted text being scrolled back into the scrollable area. In addition, the Graham patent does not teach that the area of the window displaying the concept indicator is deleted in response to the corresponding text being scrolled back into the scrollable area.

For the foregoing additional reasons, Applicants respectfully maintain that Claim 8 is not anticipated by the Graham patent, and is therefore patentable.

#### Claim 9

Claim 9 depends from Claim 4. Claim 9 has additional distinguishing recitations not taught by the Graham patent. Claim 9 has the recitations of: wherein a third subset of the information is designated as an additional materialization entity; and in response to at least a portion of the additional materialization entity being scrolled out of the scrollable area, displaying a third window comprising the additional materialization entity, at least in part, in a materialization area of the third window, wherein the third window is separate from the first window and the second window.

The Graham patent does not teach displaying a **third window** comprising the additional materialization entity, at least in part, **in a materialization area of the third window**, wherein the **third window is separate from the first window and the second window**.

In the Graham patent, the bottom portion of Figure 5 displays the thumbnail. The Graham patent does not teach that the bottom portion of Figure 5 which displays the thumbnail is displayed in response to at least a portion of any highlighted text being scrolled out of the scrollable area.

For the foregoing additional reasons, Applicants respectfully maintain that Claim 9 is not anticipated by the Graham patent.

Claim 10

Claim 10 has additional distinguishing recitations not taught by the Graham patent. Claim 10 has the recitations of: in response to the materialization entity being scrolled back into the scrollable area, deleting the materialization entity from the materialization area.

The rejection asserts that Fig. 7, col. 8, lines 19-26 teaches the recitations of Claim 10. In the Graham patent, Figs. 7A-7D illustrate representative screens in examples of particular embodiments. Col. 8, lines 19-26 of the Graham patent teaches:

FIG. 7A illustrates a browser user interface 701 for viewing an annotated document online. A first viewing area 702 in user interface 701 shows a section of an electronic document. A scroll bar 704 provides the user with the ability to scroll the displayed section through the electronic document. A plurality of selectable concept indicators 706 permit the user to identify which concepts of interest are to be noted in the document.

In Claim 10, in response to the materialization entity being scrolled back into the scrollable area, the materialization entity is deleted from the materialization area. Unlike in Claim 10, the Graham patent does not teach deleting concept indicators from the series of concept indicators. Even though the Graham patent teaches selecting and

Docket No.: SVL920030143US1

Application No. 10/815,430

Amendment After Final dated February 15, 2008

Response to Final Office Action mailed on December 26, 2007

deselecting concept indicators, the Graham patent does not teach deleting a concept indicator from the series of concept indicators. Claim 10 deletes the materialization entity from the materialization area in response to being scrolled back into the scrollable area.

For the foregoing additional reasons, Applicants respectfully maintain that Claim 10 is not anticipated by the Graham patent, and is therefore patentable.

### Claim 13

Claim 13 has additional distinguishing recitations not taught by the Graham patent. Claim 13 has the recitations of: "wherein the materialization entity is associated with a materialization entity designation of permanent, further comprising when the materialization entity designation is permanent, storing the materialization entity designation in persistent storage".

The rejection asserts that col. 6, lines 53-59 teach the recitations of Claim 13. Col 6, lines 50-63 teach:

Some embodiments can include a series of concept indicators 506 that permit the user to identify which concepts of interest are to be noted in the document. A sensitivity control 508 permits the user to select the degree of sensitivity to apply in identifying potential locations of relevant discussion. At low sensitivity, more locations will be denoted as being relevant, even though some may not be of any actual interest. At high sensitivity, most all denoted locations will in fact be relevant but some other relevant locations may be missed. Many embodiments provide a percentage giving the relevance of the currently viewed document to the concept for each concept name appearing by one of selectable concept

Docket No.: SVL920030143US1  
Application No. 10/815,430  
Amendment After Final dated February 15, 2008  
Response to Final Office Action mailed on December 26, 2007

indicators 506. These relevance levels offer a quick assessment of the relevance of the document to the selected concepts.

Claim 13 recites: when the materialization entity designation is permanent, **storing the materialization entity designation** in persistent storage. Unlike the claimed invention, the Graham patent does not teach storing a concept indicator in persistent storage.

For the foregoing additional reasons, Applicants respectfully maintain that Claim 13 is not anticipated by the Graham patent.

### Conclusion

Consequently, the Applicants believe that all these claims are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

February 15, 2008

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Janet M. Skafar, Attorney  
Reg. No. 41,315  
Correspondence Customer No. 55070  
Telephone: (650)988-0655  
Facsimile: (408) 463-4827

Attachment: Abstract